



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/500,243	10/25/2004	Kiyotaka Uchimoto	4035-0169PUS1	8938
2252	7590	11/29/2010		
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH				EXAMINER
PO BOX 747				LUDWIG, MATTHEW J
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2178	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/29/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/500,243	UCHIMOTO ET AL.
	Examiner MATTHEW J. LUDWIG	Art Unit 2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 September 2010.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-4-7 and 10-15 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1, 4-7, 10-15 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/US/06)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the Amendment received 9/10/2010.
2. Claims 1, 4-7, 10-15 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 7 are independent claims.
3. Claims 1, 4-7, and 10-15, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Weise have been withdrawn pursuant to applicant's amendments.

Claim Objections

4. The examiner would like to point out a few phrases disclosed within the independent claims that do not seem to plainly define the subject matter within the claim. As presently claimed, independent claim 1 states 'wherein the entire natural sentence is characteristic of a style or an expression'. The examiner recommends removing the phrase 'entire natural' as it fails to describe anything more than a sentence. It is unclear if a distinction should be made between a 'entire natural sentence' and 'a sentence'. Further, it is unclear to the examiner, if the parser means that analyzes the entire sentence actually creates a different sentence or creates the same sentence that was generated in the prior 'text generation step'.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
6. **Claims 1 and 7 recite the limitation 'inputted part of the sentence' in the independent claims. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.**

In reference to the independent claims 1 and 7, the claims fail to provide support in the claim for the phrase 'inputted part of the sentence'. Appropriate correction is required. Further, the use of 'entire sentence', 'entire natural sentence', and 'a sentence' throughout the independent claim fails to accurately define what is being generated and what the parsing method is actually generating. The examiner recommends modifying the language of the claim to accurately distinguish the above-mentioned phrases found in the independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. **Claims 1, 4-7, 10-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weise USPN 7,184,950 filed (7/8/2005) in view of Nakagawa USPN 6,616,703 filed (4/8/1999).**

In reference to independent claim 1, Weise teaches:

'an input step using input means for inputting only parts of the sentence wherein the natural sentence is characteristic of a style or an expression, an extracting step using extracting means for extracting candidate sentences parts or phrases, which includes an inputted part of the sentence, from a database, and

a text generation step using text generation means for generating the natural sentence based on the inputted parts of the sentence and the extracted candidate sentence parts or phrases by combining the extracted candidate sentence parts or phrases, and wherein parser means morphologically analyzes and parses the extracted at least one sentence part or phrase to obtain a syntactic structure of the at least one candidate sentence part or phrase by determining the syntactic probability of the appropriateness of the order of candidate sentence parts or phrases by applying a statistical technique using a syntactic model, thereby generating a sentence having a maximum probability of being a natural sentence which is characteristic of the style or expression'.

The reference to Weise provides a means of inputting a string of text and looks for grammar mistake through the use of a set of grammar rules. The reference provides for the input of text strings but fails to explicitly state the input of only parts of the sentence. The reference to Nakagawa teaches a similar method for the input of text strings. More specifically, the reference to Nakagawa provides a means of providing a person with difficulty inputting sentences, the ability to input parts of a sentence. In response, the processor acts on the strings input by the user and provides a means for completing a sentence based on the entry of sentence parts. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the input method of Weise with the sentence part input method of Nakagawa to provide the added benefit to a user with disabilities a similar technique for completing a sentence with sentence candidates. The system of Weise teaches a method for creating alternatives including the original string of text and storing those instances prior to parsing said content. The reference provides a means of further analyzing content through a parsing means which allows for the

content to be put through a stochastic parser as well as a syntactic model for examining the content. As presently claimed, the reference provides a means for inputting, extracting, and text generation through steps that create alternative sentences (as can be seen in figures 7 & 8 and columns 9-14) and parse the alternative and original text to develop a natural sentence. The limitations found within the claim include a step for 'extracting candidate sentence parts or phrases, which includes an inputted part of the sentence'. This limitation is being interpreted as any part of the string input. There is no antecedent basis for 'an inputted part of the sentence' and therefore, the text verb, noun, or any part of the text input would provide sufficient evidence of a part of the sentence. Also, the phrase found in the third limitation which reads, 'by combining the extracted candidate sentence parts or phrases', seems to leave out what the extracted candidate sentence parts or phrases are combined with'. This leaves the claim open to being interpreted as the alternative grammar parts or phrases being combined with the original text string as found in the reference to Weise.

In reference to dependent claim 4, Weise teaches:

a means of utilizing a set of grammar rules as well as explicit parsing method to develop a natural sentence based upon word models. See columns 9-14.

In reference to dependent claim 5, Weise teaches:

The word order model set up in dependent claim 5 is determined through a similar feature of the reference to Weise which parses each alternative and original text string to determine a parse tree and syntactic structure based upon probability measurements. See columns 13-16.

In reference to dependent claim 6, Weise teaches:

The grammar rules found in the database provide a sufficient suggestion of having a database containing characteristic text patterns. See pages 7 and 8.

In reference to dependent claim 7, 10-14, the claims recite similar language for carrying out text generation as those found in claims 1, 4-6. Therefore, the claims are rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 4-7, and 10-15 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicant amended the claims which required the examiner to withdraw the prior art rejection.

More specifically, the amendments to the claims require the input of 'parts of the sentence that do not constitute an entire sentence, wherein the entire natural sentence is characteristic of a style or an expression'. The amendments changed the scope of the claim set when the claims are read as a whole and thus required a new search and consideration of the newly amended claims.

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MATTHEW J. LUDWIG whose telephone number is (571)272-4127. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/500,243
Art Unit: 2178

Page 8

/Stephen S. Hong/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2178